



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20221
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	APPLICATION NO. FILING DATE		FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/327,766	06/	07/1999	NANCY ELLMAN	SYMA1039MCF/	5881	
23910	7590	06/20/2002				
		EYER & LOVE	EXAMINER			
FOUR EMBARCADERO CENTER SUITE 400				PARDO, THUY N		
SAN FRANC	CISCO, CA	94111		ART UNIT	ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER	
				2175	<u> </u>	
·				DATE MAILED: 06/20/2002		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<u> </u>			——————————————————————————————————————
W. F. C. A.	Application No.	A icant(s)	
Advisory Action	09/327,766	ELLMAN ET AL.	
·	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Thuy Pardo	2175	
The MAILING DATE of this communication app	ears on the cover sheet with the	correspondence addr	ess
THE REPLY FILED 31 May 2002 FAILS TO PLACE TH Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may <u>only</u> be either: (1 condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appea Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	void abandonment of this application in the same application and the same application in the same appl	ation. A proper reply th places the applicat	to a ion in
PERIOD FOR R	EPLY [check either a) or b)]		
a) The period for reply expires <u>3</u> months from the mailing da			1
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WA 706.07(f).	later than SIX MONTHS from the mailin S FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF T	ng date of the final rejection HE FINAL REJECTION.	n. See MPEP
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The see have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period ee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of 2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Offimely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37	of extension and the corresponding amount of the shortened statutory period for reply fice later than three months after the ma	ount of the fee. The appro originally set in the final C	priate extension Office action; or
 A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant' 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CF 			
The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered be	pecause:		
(a) they raise new issues that would require furth	ner consideration and/or search ((see NOTE below);	
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note	below);		
(c) they are not deemed to place the application issues for appeal; and/or	in better form for appeal by mate	erially reducing or sim	plifying the
(d) they present additional claims without cance NOTE:	ling a corresponding number of t	finally rejected claims	.
Applicant's reply has overcome the following reject	tion(s):		
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	d be allowable if submitted in a s	eparate, timely filed a	amendment
5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request fo application in condition for allowance because: Second 1.		idered but does NOT	place the
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered be raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	cause it is not directed SOLELY	to issues which were	newly
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendmen explanation of how the new or amended claims were appeared to the control of the control			nd an
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows	:		
Claim(s) allowed:			
Claim(s) objected to:			
Claim(s) rejected: 31-56.			
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			
8. The proposed drawing correction filed on is	s a)□ approved or b)□ disapp	proved by the Examir	ner.
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Stateme	ent(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s).	•	
10. Other:	Char	les of Rones L. Rones Kramina	
	Charles	L. Rones	
	Primary	examina	
	Artui	nit 2175	



Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Arguments, particularly with respect to claims 31, 36, 39, 41, and 45 are not persuasive. Kaufman teaches teaches the same functionality of wireless remote synchronization of data files on separate computers (see the title and the abstract).